



UNITED STATS DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
08/922,263	09/02/97	CROWLEY 9M41/0630		Fit Y:	35C011	
_			コ	EXAMINER		
TESTA HURWIT				SHAY, D		
HIGH STREET 125 HIGH STE				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON MA 02	2110			3739		
				DATE MAILED:	06/30/99	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

		No onies of Adv	Washington,	D.C. 20231	DEMARKS		
APPLICATION NUMBER	CATION NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		APPLICANT	ATTY, DOCKET NO.			
					EXAMINER		
				<u>.</u>			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				DATE MAILED:			
This is a communication COMMISSIONER OF P	n from the examiner in ch ATENTS AND TRADEMA	arge of your application. ARKS					
		OFFICE ACTION S	UMMARY				
m/-		MA 2 1000					
_/.		May 3, 1999		<u></u>			
This action is FINAL.		_					
		wance except for formal ma e Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 45		n as to the merits is clo	sed in		
whichever is longer, from	the mailing date of this	s action is set to expires communication. Failure to C. § 133). Extensions of times.	respond within th	e period for response wi	ll cause		
Disposition of Claims							
V Claim(s) 1-51				ia <i>lan</i> a .	a sha a a sti a sti a a		
Of the above, claim(s	18 19.31 45.46	ardSI		is/are withdrawn fro	n the application. m consideration.		
Claim(s)		, and SI 147-50		is/a	re allowed.		
Claim(s) 1-17,20	-30, 32-44, and	47-50			re rejected.		
Claim(s)				is/are eject to restriction or elec	objected to.		
Application Papers				•	-		
		Patent Drawing Review, PT					
The drawing(s) filed of the proposed drawing			is/are objected to	o by the Examiner.	I disapprovad		
_	bjected to by the Exan	niner.		is [_] approved [_	disapproved.		
The oath or declaration	on is objected to by the	Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119						
Acknowledgment is n	nade of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d).				
All Some*		RTIFIED copies of the priori		been			
		le/Serial Number)		<u> </u>	٠.		
received in this n		on from the International Bu		7.2(a)).			
*Certified copies not re	ceived:			·	·		
Acknowledgment is n	nade of a claim for don	nestic priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(e).		, .		
Attachment(s)							
Notice of Reference (Cited, PTO-892	-	. "				
		449, Paper No(s). <u>10 ⊁ l</u>)				
Interview Summary, F		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	's Patent Drawing Rev	riew, PTO-948					

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Application/Control Number: 08/922,263 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

The rejections set forth in the previous Office action are hereby repeated.

Applicant argues that the originally filed specification discloses "a device <u>capable</u> of being placed near an internal tissue region, <u>such as</u>, a catheter..." (Emphasis added). The Examiner notes that the recitation "such as" clearly denotes that the succeeding list is not exhaustive. The Examiner further notes that that with, for example, a sufficiently large incision, the device of Vona is <u>capable</u> of being placed near an internal tissue region. Since typical lithotriptors generate shock waves sufficient to produce sonolumuesence the claims are met. The preceding arguments also apply to Takayama. The Examiner has been unable to locate any disclosure in the instant specification drawn to specific "acoustic conducting media necessary to generate light." Thus the coupling fluid of Champelin is considered to be sufficient to do so.

The arguments regarding intereventional devices set forth above also apply to Ervin.

The recitation of the light sources discussed by applicant is noted. The Examiner has already discussed these sources as being well known in the art. The Examiner also notes that these particular sources are not critical to applicants invention and provide no unexpected result.

Applicant's arguments filed May 3, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Application/Control Number: 08/922,263 Page 3

Art Unit: 3739

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Applicant's arguments filed May 3, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to David Shay at

telephone number (703) 308-2215.

DAVID M. SHAY PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 380